UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA No. 2:23-cv-03452-JAK (MRWx) TODD MICHAEL SCHULTZ, Plaintiff, ORDER RE MOTION FOR SANCTIONS ON OPPOSING COUNSEL FOR DEFAMATION AND v. PERJURY (DKT. 59) MICHAEL C. THOMPSON, et al., Defendants.

Based on a review of the Motion for Sanctions on Opposing Counsel for Defamation and Perjury (the "Motion" (Dkt. 59)), insufficient good cause has been shown for the requested relief. Therefore, the Motion is **DENIED**.

Plaintiff seeks to have sanctions imposed on Defendant YouTube's counsel for arguing that Plaintiff knows or should know that his claims are barred by section 230 of the Communications Decency Act and for arguing that Plaintiff brought this suit for an improper purpose. This conduct does not constitute sanctionable misconduct. Nor does it constitute defamation: these are legal arguments rather than factual assertions, and they are protected by the litigation privilege. Arguments of this nature also do not qualify as perjury because they are arguments. In addition, arguments in legal briefs are not made under penalty of perjury. Further, although Plaintiff includes a vague reference to a "rule 4.1 (1)(2)," Plaintiff has not adequately identified any legal basis for the award of sanctions he seeks. Finally, under Local Rule 7-3, Plaintiff is required to meet and confer with opposing counsel in good faith before filing motions. The materials filed in support of the Motion do not state that Plaintiff sought to confer with counsel for Defendant YouTube prior to its filing. If Plaintiff files additional motions without meeting and conferring with opposing counsel or without citing appropriate legal authority, it may result in the issuance of an Order to Show Cause why sanctions should not be imposed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 4, 2023

am n

John A. Kronstadt

United States District Judge